

Application No. 09/665,888

INXT 1021-2

REMARKS

In the Final Official Action mailed 19 May 2005, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-4, 6-21 and 23-33. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claims 3, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claims 26 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claims 27, 28 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); and has rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 31.

Applicant has cancelled claims amended claims 1-4, 6-21 and 23-33, and added new claims 34-60. Claims 34-60 are now pending.

The rejections are moot in light of the new claims. The following comments are pertinent to the references cited by the Examiner.

The present invention is simpler and more efficient than the techniques for comparing markup language documents described in the prior art, including Aoyama, by virtue of the fact that the present invention does not require constructing trees and matching against the trees. Rather, the claimed invention constructs a sets of groups of characters delineated by block level markup tags from each document (the first and second plurality of groups in the claims), and performs a comparison of the two sets of groups.

Note that the term "block-level" is a term of art in the markup language arts, distinguished from text level or inline elements by formatting and content models. See for example Section 7.5.3, "Block-level and Inline elements," HTML 4.01 Specification, W3C Recommendation 24 December 1999.

The present invention can process documents whose markup cannot be represented as a strict tree structure. This is possible, again, because as the claims state, the claimed process converts the documents into sets of groups based on block-level markup tags, rather than into trees.

Furthermore, limitations have been added to the independent claims concerning the difference document. Claim 34 includes the following limitations:

Application No. 09/665,888

INXT 1021-2

composing a difference document comprising a third plurality of groups that include identified differences, and including elements that identify the differences; and rendering an image of the difference document using a computer while preserving visual formatting of one of the first and second documents, with visual features denoting the identified differences.

These added limitations are supported in the specification at page 5, line 20 to page 6, line 4, and throughout.

Original claim 15, now canceled, included the limitation that the comparison result would be viewed with formatting intact. Claim 15 did not however, clearly include the features stated in the new claims, requiring elements be added to the difference document denoting differences, in combination with preserving visual formatting from one of the first and second documents. The Examiner cited Aoyama, col. 13, lines 50-60; col. 9, line 5, Fig. 11B and Figs. 3A and 3B, in the rejection of claim 15. However, none of the cited passages suggest the features quoted above in claim 34. Fig. 11B of Aoyama shows underlining of the changes. However, as can be seen in the description of Fig. 11B, at col. 8, line 60 to col. 9, line 7 of Aoyama, the underlining is used to aid the description of the process, and does not constitute added elements in a difference document as required by the claims herein.

Independent claims 43 and 52 include corresponding limitations.

Thus, the new claims require additional elements be added to provide visual formatting to delineate the changes and insertions, and to form a new document referred to as the difference document in the claims. This allows the changes between the documents to be viewed as new document with changes and insertions denoted (e.g., highlighted) visually in their original context. None of the references in the record describe block level parsing, nor the formation of a difference document as recited in the new claims.

Application No. 09/665,888

INXT 1021-2

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee determined to be due in connection with this communication, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0869 (INXT 1021-2).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 29 Aug, 2005



Mark A. Haynes, Reg. No. 30,846

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P.O. Box 366
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
(650) 712-0340 phone
(650) 712-0263 fax